DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 292 FL 004 120

AUTHOR Petrounias, E.
TITLE Modern Greek Diglossia and Its Sociocultural Implications.
INSTITUTION Monash Univ., Clayton, Victoria (Australia).
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 40p.; In Linguistic Communications, 2, 1970. Paper presented at the 13th Congress of the Australian Universities Language and Literature Association, Monash University, August 1970

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Diachronic Linguistics; *Diglossia; *Greek; History; *Language Development; Language Planning; *Language Role; Language Standardization; Language Styles; Language Usage; Morphology (Languages); Official Languages; Phonemics; Pronunciation; Regional Dialects; Semantics; *Sociolinguistics; Spelling; Syntax

ABSTRACT

This article explains the linguistic situation in Greece and the condition of diglossia that has arisen there through the use of common Modern Greek, developing from the Athenian dialect into a medium of communication used by all Greeks, and the use of Katharevusa, the "pure" or "purifying" language which is supposedly an imitation of Ancient Greek. The author compares selected features of the two languages in the areas of pronunciation, morphology, semantics, syntax, and spelling. A lengthy discussion concerning the historical reasons leading to the existence of modern Greek diglossia is provided along with remarks concerning the creation of Katharevusa. Using Charles Ferguson's theories concerning diglossia typology, the author applies them to the Greek situation and demonstrates the role of both languages seeking to establish a typology. Concluding remarks concern what effect Greek diglossia is having on Greek education. (VM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 077292

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

From: Linguistic Communications, 2, 1970.

MODERN GREEK DIGLOSSIA AND ITS SOCIOCULTURAL IMPLICATIONS*

E. Petrounias
University of California, Los Angeles

"Common Modern Greek"[1] is the new Athenian dialect. It is based primarily on the dialects of the Peloponnesos of the 19th century, though its origins can be traced further back. This means that it is a southern dialect. Northern dialects differ quite a lot phonemically and consequently also in their morphology.

The new Athenian dialect has been developing into a medium of communication used by all Greeks, in Greece or abroad, either exclusively or in addition to a regional dialect; a condition reminiscent of that in France (dialect of Ile de France or Paris dialect). Naturally during this process it accepts or retains for some time forms belonging to other dialects. This causes Common MG to be at the moment less strict about its rules than any regional dialect. But there is a second, more important reason to this: the existence of a superposed linguistic variety, which makes educated Greeks very insecure in their linguistic habits.

FL 004 120

---

* This article contains principally the exposition presented at the 13th AULLA Congress (Monash University, August, 1970) in a paper entitled: "The State of the Greek Language Today from a Sociolinguistic Aspect".

1 After their first mentioning, terms will be abbreviated as follows: Ancient Greek : AG; Modern Greek : MG; dimotikí (a different name for Common MG) : D; Katharévusa (the superposed variety or "learned" language) : K.

Phonemically and as far as we can say in actual pronunciation modern Greek dialects differ considerably from ancient Greek ones[2] e.g., "Classical Greek" (Attic dialect 5/4th century B.C.) in all probability possessed ten vowel phonemes, fifteen consonant phonemes and was a tone language; Common MG possesses five vowel phonemes, seventeen to twenty-four consonant phonemes (according to the phonemic theory one follows) and is a stress language. Although changes are the result of a continuous development and many of them can be traced back to very ancient times, the overall difference is so great, that one should speak of two different languages.

Concerning morphology and structure of vocabulary, MG is structurally very similar to AG, and at the same time rather different from most modern European languages. This fact authorizes philologists to speak of two phases in the development of the same language and not of two distinct languages. Among several factors which account for the (comparatively few) changes, the tendency to regularization is the most far reaching.

These two basic facts, on the one hand similarity in morphology and the structure of vocabulary, on the other hand great differences in pronunciation, played a decisive role in the creation of a peculiar problem: modern Greek diglossia.

---

2 Most modern dialects are based on Hellenistic Koiné, based in its turn on Attic.

CREATION OF MODERN GREEK DIGLOSSIA

We are using the term as distinct from bilingualism, as used by French linguists, though André Martinet notably disapproves of it[3]. Charles Ferguson, in an article to which we will return below, adopts the term in English, to denote the use of two or more varieties of the same language by some speakers under different conditions; we should add, as distinct from regional dialects.

In individual cases already before 1800, but especially in the 19th century many educated Greeks discovered that the Greek language was decadent and dirty and set about to replace it by what in their opinion was Ancient Greek. Since then, in addition to regional dialects and common language, a third medium of communication exists for official use and is taught in schools. It is called "Katharévusa", ie., the "pure" or "purifying" language and is supposed by some to be an imitation of AG.

Modern Greek diglossia has its prehistory in Byzantine diglossia. Like Latin in Western Europe, AG (more or less the Attic dialect) was the written language in Byzantium. It was learned at schools like the University of Constantinople. AG though had a far broader role to play in Byzantium than Latin in the West. It was a literary style, it was the medium of bureaucratic communications of a highly centralized state and the common denominator of a ruling class, which had no titles of nobility like aristocracies in Western Europe and which was of various ethnic and linguistic origin, though the majority among them may have been native speakers of (Medieval) Greek.

---

3 Eléments de linguistique générale, pp. 149-150.

Gradually AG became also the language of the Church, as the official church was progressively being absorbed by the ruling class.

AG was both written and spoken, though with contemporary pronunciation, the Byzantines not being aware of linguistic changes in this respect [4]. How far spoken usage approximated Attic standard can only be guessed.

Use of AG did not mean any acceptance of Greek ideals, against which Byzantines were extremely inimical. The very word for "Greek" élin (Hellen) meant "pagan, idolater". The state was called Romanía, the inhabitants Roméi (hence MG Romjós). It needs hardly to be mentioned that in a state which was the image of Heavenly Kingdom on earth, no conception of "nation" could exist: éthnos (AG usually "nation")and the adjective enthikós were used in the meaning "non Christian and non Jew", assuredly under Hebrew and not under Aristotelian influence[5]. Within the boundaries of the state there was no question of using national language - Medieval Greek was one of them - for literary purposes.

As the internal history of modern Greek diglossia and the subsequent controversy is of no general interest and as there exist several presentations of it both in French and German, some in English, it is not necessary to dwell long on it. On this subject there are good presentations by André Mirambel and a concise one by Albert Dauzat[6].

---

4 Notwithstanding the opposite thesis ingeniously presented by Hesseling and Pernot: Révue des Etudes Grecques 1919.

5 For AG worxs the handiest and best orientation is offered by the new edition of the Liddell-Scott dictionary by Stuart Jones and McKenzie. For Byzantine Greek one has to be satisfied with the old dictionaries of Du Cange and of Sophocles. A MG dictionary worth its name simply does not exist. We are expecting the Greek-English dictionary, on which Georgacas has been working for years.

The best presentation is without doubt the one by Roger Milliex: Le Grec moderne langue "barbare"[7]. A full bibliography until 1938 can be found in Triandafyllides' Historical Introduction to the Modern Greek Grammar (in Greek).

To put the results of these investigations in one sentence, we can say that, as a general rule, with a few notable exceptions like Coray, the closer an educated person in the last two centuries stood to European enlightenment, the more he understood about modern languages and the more affinity he felt to his own people, the more he took side for the popular language.

LINGUISTIC FORM

After the liberation of a small part of Greece, and especially in the middle of the 19th century, the avowed aim was the resurrection of some kind of AG, probably of the Attic dialect, perhaps of the 4th century B.C. Actually the idea was not conceived so concretely. The programme called for a change of the contemporary language in direction "Ancient Greek" in consecutive stages in a matter of some decades.

What actually happened was the following: several forms of K were created individually with the help of ancient dictionaries and grammars. These forms resem led more or less some form of AG, from Attic to Hellenistic. As such forms could be understood only by a few dozen individuals, more and more approximations of the spoken language appeared.

---

6 L' Europe linguistique.

7 In Offerings to the Memory of Manolis Triandafyllidis (title in Greek), Hellenica 1962.

The morphological systems of A and MG, as we already mentioned, are not very different from each other. This meant that a partial confusion of both forms was easy, especially as difference in pronunciation was never mentioned. Natural interference from the mother-tongue did not permit K to be learned as a foreign language. There was not enough motivation either: Common MG was already being formed, and even persons using only their regional dialects had no great difficulty to understand each other.

The only practical use of learning K was to become a member of the ruling group, and too few persons could aspire to that. Byzantine conditions could not apply to a tiny state of modern Europe, with the large majority of the inhabitants speaking the same language.

Although no one could be aware of the fact at the time, from the very beginning there existed more forms of K than all modern dialects taken together. We should not forget that in a country as small as Greece in the middle of the 19th century (approximately one fourth of the present territory, including an even smaller proportion of Greek nationals), having only recently been liberated from an old-fashioned foreign rule, not too many persons were liable to know AG well enough. The rest of those who endeavoured to use K, thought happily this <u>was</u> AG.

It was precisely among those who did know AG that reaction against K began. Konstantinos Asopios, perhaps the best literary critic in 19th century Greece, pointed out that literary language of his time was in reality French dressed in words taken over from different periods of the history of the Greek language[8].

This form of K is dying out, as today literature and essays are written in the natural language. What, in our opinion, is being overlooked, is that one of the forms of K that persists today, official language as used in the text of laws, in official decrees, in the army, in petitions to Ministries, in school certificates and the like, is principally a translation of the German "Kanzleisprache" of the 19th century. The explanation of the phenomenon is easy: The first Greek bureaucracy was imported from Bavaria together with the first king, Otto. Incidentally this is the only form of K that does have a norm, in the sense that official formulas tend to remain unchanged.

Today it is exactly the classical scholars, at least the best among them, and linguists, together with authors and poets, who do not want to have anything to do with K. This last development separated K from AG even more. This further separation clarified the principle underlying K: Katharevusa is modified or changed Modern Greek. How much modified and to what direction is of secondary importance. If one changes common language much, one is supposed to write "strict K" or "archaic language"; in such cases an approximation to AG is possible. If one changes common language less, one is supposed to write a so-called "mixed" language. Sometimes the addition of a few final -n's, the use of some consonant clusters unacceptable in regional dialects, of some irregular forms of nouns may be considered as enough.

---

8 The elegant society spoke French on most occasions; see P. Burney, La langue et la culture francaise dans la Gréce actuelle: Le francais moderne 29, 1 (Janvier 1961).

Even a few violations of the rules of MG may be enough proof of K. On the other hand, the use of only phonetic changes with minimal or no morphological ones is more liable to be laughed at.

People in Greece are speaking of diglossia; others are speaking of triglossia, polyglossia, avowed foes of K of aglossia. It is interesting to notice that unscientific arguments, typical in cases of diglossia, have hindered the formulation of the principle formulated above.

It can be further specified that K is MG minus norm, or MG plus violation of any amount of rules plus tokens of "AG", or "non-MG and non-AG", or especially for the benefit of classicists, "Modern Greek Pseudoatticism".

Let us consider some examples: Pronunciation: "Russia" /i ru 'sia/(Rusija, cp. ruskaja) became /i ro'sia/ Ofcourse there is no question of borrowing from AG in this case. Still, the change was supported by the existence of the ethnic name /'ros/in Byzantine authors. But for /i iapo'nia/ instead of /i japo'nia/ "Japan" there was not even a Byzantine support. The change in this case is accompanied by the violation of the rule of avoidance of hiatus. This rule is valid for both A and MG. /'kozmos/ "world" becomes /'kosmos/, the town /'zmirni/ becomes /'smirni/ Again a violation of the phonetic rules of both A and MG. The latter are examples of spelling pronunciations, "tree", in AG /déndron/, in MG /'ðendro/, becomes through a spelling pronunciation /'ðendron/: again a form impossible for both A and MG. The reason for this is that the letter [δ] is in MG the symbol of a phoneme always realized as interdental voiced fricative, while in editions of ancient texts the same letter symbolizes a phoneme realized as dental voiced stop, and users of K are as a rule not aware of the difference. Ofcourse spelling pronunciations exist in all langu ges with a complicated spelling: many English

speakers try to pronounce a t in "often", and the French philosopher became "Montaigne" after his death. But in K there exist hundreds of similar examples, and, what is more important, most of them violate the phonemic rules of the Greek language. A more equivalent example in English would be to pronounce a p at the beginning of the prefix "pseudo-".

Morphology: "Child" /to pe'ði/becomes in K /to pe'ðion/. In Classical Greek /to pe'ðion/ (in reality /to paidíon/!) was not a very common synonym of /ho pàis/and it meant "a young child, under seven years of age". The use in the meaning "child" in general is Hellenistic. "Boots" /i ar'viles/ as faminine was not Aeschylean enough for army jargon: it became a neuter /ta 'arvila/ with stress shift (analogy to /ta 'pedila/?). Accusative of /i ti 'mi " honour" is /ti(n)di'mi/, according to the morphophonemic rules of the language: K makes /tin ti'min/: a half-way approximation of AG. But it can also produce /tin mi'teran/. "mother"; a form that any student of AG would consider as incorrect. Imperative of /para'gelno/ "I order" can become /pa'rigile/: an (internal) augment in the imperative! It does not help much to expl in that the hybrid form is due to the confusion of reintroducing the so-called temporal augment to the past tense, while MG accepts only the so-called syllabic augment and this mostly or exclusively as a subsidiary of past tense stress shift. It does not help either to condemn the form as non-Attic and those who use it as illiterates, because K does not follow Attic norm anyway[9].

---

9. Others would use in K this case the form /pa'ragile/ Others would condemn this form too as non-Attic and use /pa'ragilon/. No one would try to use ancient pronunciation.

"rifle" /ðu'feki/ from Turkish /tyfek/ is a word that everybody uses; consequently a dirty word. In army jargon it became /ti'fekion/. The lengthened ending, together with the change of /d/ to /t/ and of /u/ to /i/ is supposed to add Attic flavour. So it happened, that the purified form came closer to the original Turkish word. One of the principal aims of K was to purify the language from Turkisms. Incidentally it should be added, that most of the other Balkan peoples too, for nationalistic reasons, have been trying to expurgate Turkisms, - without abandoning their own language.

A language distinguishing between first and second person must as a rule use different forms for the personal pronoun: we-you, nous-vous, wir-Ihr or Sie, MG/e'mis - e'sis/, AG /hɛ'mè's - hy'mè's/ Medieval Greek /i'mis - y'mis/[10]. Not so K; trying to imitate AG while overlooking pronunciation, no distinction can be made: /i'mis - I'mis/. There exists a great number of similar homonyms, a standard stock of childish puns in Greek.

Keeping to the rules of a given language and not wanting to change the meaning or add emphasis, the short sentence "I was in town yesterday" will be "hier j' étais à la ville", "gestern war ich in der Stadt", MG/'xtes 'imuna sti'boli/. In K we can have: for "yesterday" /'xθes/ or /ex'θes/, for "I was"/'imun/ or /'imin/for "in town"/stin'polin/or/istin' polin/ or /anti'poli/; twelve possibilities, without changing the meaning or adding emphasis. Any of these possibilities can be attacked as incorrect, as there is no way of determining which is the correct one. It is no wonder that Greeks with an education equivalent to that of American college are extremely insecure in their linguistic habits.

---

10. When after the 10th century /y/became /i/, the system of the personal pronouns was put on a different basis, among other reasons in order to preserve the opposition.

In our example, only two possibilities are excluded: the above mentioned MG form and its AG equivalent. No one would namely say /'xθes 'in en'asti/, much less with some approximation of ancient pronunciation /kt^{h}és è·n en áste·/

Semantics: If we believe the most illustrious Atticist of modern Greece and leader of the K movement, Konstantinos Kontos, the language of the New Testament is /i'varvaros ke moxθi'ra 'ɣlosa ton evageli'ston/. In a text written less than 80 years ago, we are at a loss to guess what the author exactly means. /i 'ɣlosa ton evageli'ston/ is "the language of the Gospel writers". But what is this language supposed to be? Does /'varvaros/ mean "barbarous", like in all modern languages? Or does it mean "non-Greek" "foreign" as usually in AG? Or perhaps "not understandable", as e.g., in Aeschylus? Or "full of solecisms", as in the Alexandrian grammarians? And what is /moxθi'ra/? "miserable" or "wretched" or "worthless" or "in a bad state" or "malignant" or simply "bad"? Not intentional ambiguities are not exactly the ideal of any writer, ancient or modern!

The very name of the idiom is equivocal. Katharévusa was a rare term used by Alexandrian Atticists to denote that the langue they were using was "pure" Attic dialect (according to them, Athenians stopped speaking after the 4th century b.C.), and not contemporary Greek. Very few Greeks at present can make the connection katharévusa = katharí. Most, if asked to think of it, would probably explain katharévusa = purifying, because the participial ending -usa (fem.) though not belonging to the system of MG, through several loan-words from AG having this ending, is acquainted with the notion of a handling agent.

Let us consider an example of official use of K, i.e., the form of it which comes closer to a norm. Till he was well advanced with his school studies, the author of the present article had repeatedly puzzled over following inscription in trams: /paraka'lisθe 'opos 'eçite to acri'ves an'ditimon tu isiti'riu ana 'çiras/. It was supposed to instruct passengers to have their exact fare ready.

The meaning "I ask to, please" for the verb /paraka'lo/ is MG; the closest ancient equivalent would be the meaning "beseach, entreat" in Hellenistic Greek. But the verb is not used in the imperfective stem of the passive voice in Greek, and even the use in the perfective stem of the passive voice would be rare[11]. In general, MG makes a rarer use of passive voice than either English or French or German of corresponding passive constructions. The verb must be used in the active voice with a personal pronoun: /sas paraka 'lume/ "We ask you to". As the verb has still a strong meaning in Greek, this more personal expression would retain its full force. We have here a MG meaning, a pseudo-classical ending (-'isθe: Classical Greek would be -è'st^{h}e, MG -'jeste) combined with a non-Greek use: though in this case one cannot decide on linguistic considerations alone whether there is a translation from German "Sie werden gebeten" or from French "vous êtes priés".

Still the word can be approximately understood, because its stem (the first seven phonemes) is the same in the natural language.

But /'opos/ means "like, such as". In Hellenistic Greek the syntax /paraka'lo 'opos: is rare; much commoner is /paraka'lo'ina/. This last use would presumably be too reminiscent of the real MG construction /paraka'lo na/: /'eçite/ instead of /'eçete/ violates the basic opposition

in the function of MG verb, namely uniform past endings v. uniform non-past endings. It is also difficult to be understood by southern Greeks and consequently in Athens, where the trams operated.[12].

There exists an adverb /akri'vos/ "exactly", but /akri'ves/ can only be fem. plur. of/akri'vos/"expensive" a meaning that the owners of the company certainly did not intend to convey.

The fact that several uses of the French preposition "de" or of German noun composition correspond to a genitive in Greek does not mean that all similar uses in these languages can be covered by a Greek genitive. /tu isiti'riu/ is very probably a translation of German "Fahrgeld".

The rare Hellenistic use of /ana 'çiras/ "in hand" does not help understanding much. Making concessions for the ending, one would perhaps understand /'çiras/ = "widows"

We insisted on an analysis of this inscriptiom, because it is a typical example of what would be termed "strict K" or "archaic language", A MG equivalent could be /sas paraka'lume na 'eçet 'etima ta le 'fta to isi' tiri'o sas/. According to the principle "change MG, K can produce any mixture of Classical, Hellenistic, occasionally MG and K proper creations together with loan-translations from German or French.

---

11. This shows that K is creative, if only one adheres to the above outlined principle.

12. /'eçite/ would be a half-way approximation to /'eçiti/ of northern dialects and the K endings are ofcourse not similar to the classical ending /'te/.

The lack of norm applies to written K. This idiom is very rarely spoken. A similar observation was recently made for Arabic diglossia[13]. But there is an important difference: Arabic superposed variety is spoken and it is this form that does not have a norm. while written superposed variety does have one.

FUNCTION

K is not understood by the majority of the population. Nevertheless even in Melbourne trams can be seen inscriptions like the one analyzed above, presumably for the benefit of Greek immigrants who cannot read English. It is doubtful whether those Greeks who really do not understand English became any wiser through the "Greek" inscription. When still a student in Athens, the author of this article tried with a colleague to discover an ancient cite in Boeotia. According to the university text book, one had to look for a deserted village /egataleli'menon xo 'rion/. People asked denied having such a thing in their district. In the end it dawned upon the prospective explorers to ask whether there was a /'erimo xo 'rjo/ in the vicinity. They were immediately rewarded by a sign with the hand and the joyful exclamation: "it's over there!". Still if we believe the big edition of Divry's English-Greek Dictionary, probably the most widely used, one should ask for the /egataleli'menon xo'rion/.

This is probably one of the reasons, why in such a conservative community like Jannena in NW Greece people listen to the (Maoist) Albanian radio: Radio Tirana uses Common MG in its broadcasts for Greece.

---

13. see Lingua 1970. I owe the reference to Mr. B. Jernudd, Linguistics Department, Monash University.

At the entrance of several public services one can see a person sitting in front of a small table equipped with writing materials. He is the so-called /etisio 'grafos/ "Petition writer" who knows the bureaucratic formulaic expressions and can write the petitions of a not necessarily illiterate public.

After an unsuccessful attempt in the last century, no literature, either poetry or prose, or theatre, is conceivable in K. Also philosophical and literary essays are almost exclusively a domain of Common MG. The same is true for belletristic in general, cinema, advertisements.

Most schoolbooks are written in K. The same is true for the majority of technical books. K. is further the language of laws and decrees, of communication with the authorities, of courts, newsagencies, commercial letters, most private announcements in newspapers; especially notifications of funerals are in K, while notifications of marriages are increasingly written in Common MG. K is demanded in most kinds of examinations.

It would be rather far-fetched to speak of scientific literature in Greece. The few scientific books worth this name, especially in the fields of classics and linguistics, are more and more written in Common Mg. Nevertheless, K is supposed to be the "scientific" language. The reason is that textbooks for students are usually written in it. In reality, scientific language in Greece, for the few persons who can afford it, is English or German. Most of the important scientific contributions made by Greeks are equally in these two languages and in French.

At the one school of letters of international renown, that of Salonica, Common MG is used. The same happens at the new school at Jannena. At the third, that of Athens, K is obligatory. The rest of university schools use more or less K. Professors at the schools of law and theology and at the school of letters in Athens are firm supporters if K (a student will not pass the exams or will not even be admitted, if he does not try to use it). Usually the teacher reads aloud from a text written in any form of K. As a rule, there is no discussion.

A few politicians have begun using Common MG. With the majority of political speeches though, what happens is this: the speaker reads aloud from a K text. The text contains certain amount of slogans. The majority of the listeners catch these slogans when they appear and react accordingly. This applies to political candidates before the dictatorship as well as to the present military rulers. In parliament, a prepared speech would be in K; the more hot the issuing debate, the closer deputies came to using common language.

Very few persons use K in actual conversation. If one tries to express sentiments in it, either in writing or orally, one sounds ridiculous. Lawyers use it in court. Some professors use it with colleagues or with students, especially if the occasion seems "official". In schools, according to the individual teacher, school children may have to answer in K; actually they are repeating sentences from the textbook that they have tried to learn by heart. The same happens with soldiers during basic instruction. In rare cases, the choice of language can be triggered by one of the participants to the conversations, nevertheless, we witnessed a case of

two professors holding a long conversation and using throughout, because of their respective linguistic convictions, each a different linguistic form. In rare occasions, K can be used as a sign of showing the cold shoulder. More often, it can be used by friends for a joking similar purpose. In isolated cases it can be used to denote formality, or when one feels uncomfortable, but it is not connected with politeness. Common MG uses a whole gammut of politeness formulas.

Needless to stress the point, that such individuals have had a university education (universities correspond approx. to American colleges, but the proportion of people with university education is one of the lowest in Europe). A greater amount of persons manage to remember an amount of K forms and expressions and use them like formulas in a context, that is very far from any consistent norm. To the latter category belong mainly members of the lower strata of the ruling class, not sensitive enough to the fact that they become the laughing stock of both proponents and opponents of K. The members of the present military government come from these lower strata. Many persons of the above categories, if asked, will answer that they <u>do</u> use K most of the time, and keep common language only for the uneducated. They will become more aware of actual circumstances, if asked to define in what language they express their feelings.

There exists a literary genre in which people are presented in mixing K forms with Common MG and proceeding to all sorts of ridiculous overcompensations (a phenomenon known from the learning of foreign languages). Up to the second war, the target of this sort of humour were the persons using such a confusing idiom. In the last decades,

as e.g., often in the highly esoteric caricatures by Bostandzoglu, the point has been shifting against the reasons of the confusion, i.e., against diglossia. Occasionally this genre is imitated in conversation.

As K does not give the impression of connecting the community with the outside world, it is not used to add glamour: in fashionable shops one will not be confronted with K, but with common language spiced with French words.

ARGUMENTS

Because K can practically only be written, it was named by its proponents "written language". This term, especially when translated into German "Schriftsprache", can obtain connotations that it does not have in Greek. In some instances, ever the term "Hochgriechisch" has been used, in conscious but false imitation of the term "Hochdeutsch".

As it is typical in other cases of diglossia that have been studied (see below), many people consider the superposed variety to be the "good" language. Not only is it the language of the Gospels, it is also "beautiful". The psychological connection is that uneducated persons have the opportunity to hear K mostly on solemn occasions. The less one understands it, the more one tends to be impressed by it. The less intellectual one is, the more one tends to consider K as the "good" language. It is also believed to be similar to AG. It is supposed to possess a norm, while popular language does not have one. In latter case we are confronted with a widespread mistake, even among older linguists, in dealing with "Modern Greek" to mix up different modern Greek dialects and present under the same heading different grammatical examples who simply do not belong together in

any dialect. This becomes more understandable, if one takes into consideration that there exists no linguistic atlas of Greece.[14].

One can hear the argument that e.g., the English too read Chaucer at school; so why should not the Greeks learn to write their "old" language? A widespread argument is based upon a confusion between linguistic norm and style: all great authors change common language, "Sophocles and Plato did not write like the longshoremen of Piraeus spoke". The author of the present article witnessed the last sentence being used fifteen years ago by a "Professor at the Chair of History of the Greek Language".

INFLUENCE ON COMMON MODERN GREEK

If K has no norm, it has on the other hand weakened the norm of Common MG. Some consonant clusters, like those consisting of two voiceless fricatives, are now more or less accepted in Common MG through K influence, while regional dialects accept only /sf/ The so-called third declension of nouns can be heard in Athens as well as some internal augments by verbs etc. These are ofcourse irregular forms, though they have at present the tendency to become common patterns. Further irregular forms are picked up from newspapers and radio, while speakers are not sure when and how to use them. Regional dialects are more strict in their rules. Thus in the development of Common MG there is at present a reverse tendency to that prevailing in the creation of Hellenistic Koiné: Common MG is more complicated in its morphology than regional dialects.

It is possible to distinguish at present between simple Common Greek (aplí ðimotikí) and radical Modern Greek (maljarí)[15], according to whether an author makes some concessions to such irregularities or not. There exists already a number of "purists", who protest against such "adulterations", as they call them of the common language through forms taken over from K. Words taken over from K usually keep in Common MG their irregular form: /asθe'nis/, an exact synonym of /'arostos/"ill", is used with the cluster /sθ/; the attempt to regularize it in /aste'nis/would be considered as "maljarí language. There is more uncertainty with words existing in many regional dialects but having at the same time a strong learned influence: /je'naris/ "January" instead of /ianu'arios/ (K) can be considered poetic or affected. There also exist etymological doublets, one of popular, the other of learned origin; some of them can have a different meaning[16].

There are only slightvariations in spelling between Common MG and K. Different forms of the same word, one belonging to Common MG, the other to K, appear as isoglosses and are written accordingly. There is some lack of consistency in the representation of final -n, especially in Sandhi, and of elision[17].

---

14. Even K forms foreign to any regional dialect and to Common MG, forms not used and in many cases not understood by the large majority of native speakers can be mixed up with forms belonging to different regional dialects. Good examples of such presentation of "Modern Greek" are the third edition of Thumb's Grammar by Kallitsunakis (Sammlung Göschen) and the Reverse Dictionary of Modern Greek by Kurmulis (Athens 1968).

15. /ma'lja/ means "hair!". The name was ironically used at the beginning of the century, because a number of the pioneers and militant supporters of ðimotikí in literature wore long hair. In their zeal they made some (linguistic) exaggerations.

Proponents of Common MG argue in several cases for more uniform spelling. Occasionally K changes the spelling of a word to make it more unusual. Arguments are usually based on etymological principles.

An orthographic reform (simplification of historical orthography) has not been put through. There have been proposals to use uniform symbols for the same phonemes or to introduce Latin alphabet. The proposal of a partial orthographic reform, namely unification of stress-symbols and elimination of "spiriti"[18] was the cause of a notorious process after the second war in which the most renown classical scholar of the country, J. Kaktidis, was accused of communism and fired from the University of Athens. Two decades later, a newspaper for rationalization reasons (lower printing costs) introduced a similar system, in a context totally unrelated to the linguistic problems: this newspaper uses mostly "strict" K. There was no outcry this time.

In an interesting article with the title "Diglossia"[19], Charles Ferguson attempts a typology of cases of diglossia. Best known cases which he analyzes are those of Arabic, Modern Greek, Swiss German and Haitian Creole. Unfortunately several of his arguments concerning MG are incorrect. What he says, could have been valid for Byzantine diglossia - under the proviso, that for an undefinable percentage of the elite of the time the superposed variety did not constitute a case of diglossia but a case of bilingualism.

---

16. Several examples can be found in Triandafyllides' Grammar, Athens 1941 (in Greek).

17. It can be argued, that in a morphophonemic spelling final -n should always be noted, elision never. In our opinion this is not necessary, as MG is much simpler in its morphophonemics than e.g., English.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER CASES OF DIGLOSSIA

Concerning MG diglossia, the author states that the superposed variety is based upon "a respected body of literature of an earlier period". He means ofcourse ancient literature. We saw that, although this may have been the aim in the past, the similarity of K to AG is a fictitious one. A further implication of the author's assertion is to characterize K as a literary language. However one wants to define "literary language", one should not overlook the fact, that literature, and to a great extent belletristic and essays, do not exist any more in K. He also equates regional dialects (in plural) with Common MG (i.e., the new Athenian dialect)[20].

Let us consider Ferguson's conclusions about diglossia in general and see how far these apply to MG [21].

- Sermon in church or mosque is in the superposed variety[22]:

to a great extent true for Greece, but with important exceptions.

- Instructions to workmen etc., in the common language[22]:

true.

- Personal letter, in SV: not true for Greece; in the few cases when this happens, the receivers make fun of the sender.

---

18. Different stress signs are supposed to denote what kind of tone a word had, different "spiriti" the presence or absence of initial h- in the language 2500 years ago though at that time these symbols had not been introduced yet.

19. Word 15, 1959, pp.325-340.

20. pp. 330-1, 327.

21. Most of his conclusions are on p.329; see also pp. 331, 332, 334.

22. We keep the term "superposed variety" for K and use the term "common Language" for L; they are shortened

- Speech in parliament, political speech, in SV; true for the majority of cases.

- University lecture, in SV: true mostly for the University of Athens.

- Conversation with family, friends, in CL: true.

- News broadcast, in SV: true.

- Radio "soap opera", in CL: true.

- Newspaper editorial, news story, in SV: partly true.

- Caption on political cartoon, in CL: true.

- Poetry, in SL: assolutely false for Greece[23].

- Folk literature, in CL: true.

- An outsider who learns CL and then uses it in formal speech is an object of ridicule: not true.

- A member of the speech community who uses SV in a purely conversational situation is a matter of ridicule: true.

- Certain proverbs, politeness formulas, and the like (are in SV) even when cited in ordinary conversation by illiterates: not true. On the contrary, proverbs in CL can be used in A K context[24].

SV and CL respectively. But we are not using Ferguson's conventions H(igh) for K and L(ow) for D, as these terms can give a false impression, and at least in the case of MG their equivalents have been used in the past to present a point of view. In the case of MG it would also be a matter of too arbitrary a decision, which variety to call H(igh): "high" could apply to K, if we consider the fact that K is a dialect imposed from above; it could apply to D, if we consider the fact, that D is the only form used in literature and the only one that has a norm.

23. Ferguson is aware of the fact, that "Modern Greek does not quite fit this description. Peotry in (CL) is the major production and (SV) verse is generally felt to be artificial". In reality, no poetry was produced in K since the last century. From last century there exists the poetry of the "Ionian School", in C, considered of high quality, and the poetry of the "Athenian School", in K. Latter, if read at all today, it is read mostly to be made fun of. Only at the

- CL is morphologically simpler than SV: true.

- There is a strong tradition of grammatical study of SV: not true. As K is artificial, linguists are o not interested in it. The only grammars of K are normative grammars (each representing the norm of the particular author) for the use of schoolchildren. One has the strong feeling, that Ferguson is confusing K with AG.

- There exist only few studies of CL and most of them are by foreign scholars and in foreign languages: true.

- There is wide variation in pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary in CL compared to SV: the situation in MG is exactly the reverse.

Out of Ferguson's 19 statements concerning the typology of diglossia, 9 are correct in regard to MG, 4 are only partly correct, 6 are false. Ofcourse this makes one reluctant to accept the same statements in regard to the other languages he analyses. Still, if we want to accept the rest of his typology for what it is worth, especially in the case of Arabic, as he himself is an Arabist, we must conclude that compared to other studied cases, MG diglossia is a rather particular case.

University of Athens it was taught for a certain number of years a literary subject.

24. The form /' cerete/ "good day", a synonym of /kali'mera/ or /'jasas/ /'jasu/ used for more deference or more formality, is the only example that comes easily in mind of K origin. It belongs by now to CL as an adverbial expression. As it was mentioned above, CL possesses a full gammut of politeness formulas.

25. p. 328

26. pp. 328-9

Ferguson correctly notes that the trend is a unified standard based on the Athenian dialect with a mixture of vocabulary from K. It should be added, that there is also some a mixture of K morphology. But it is not correct that there is a strict specialization of their function with very little overlapping of the two sets[25].

Ferguson points out[26] that the proponents of the superposed varieties argue that these must be adopted because they connect the community with their glorious pasts or with the world community and because they are a naturally unifying factor as opposed to the divisive nature of dialects. He adds that these arguments fundamentally sound. This may well be the case in the Arab countries (connection with a "glorious past" and with a broader community), In Switzerland and in Haiti (connection with the world community). In Greece though the second of the above arguments was put forward only by some classicists in the past and is obviously incorrect. The other two arguments are in fact used, but, as we saw, they are fundamentally unsound. Especially concerning the last one, as K is itself a superposed dialect, and one without the norm at that, it is actually a divisive element in Greece as opposed to the naturally unifying factor of common language.

We know of movements in different countries to replace a more or less commonly used language. Such movements are usually connected with nationalistic tendencies and are pursued even at the risk of isolating the country from the world community. In Ireland and in Norway, reformers try to replace a language introduced in later centuries by a more indigenous language, still used in some

form by a speech community. In Israel, an ancient language has to replace several different languages used by different segments of the population. Apart from the nationalistic purpose, this also helps mutual understanding The ancient language can be learned as a foreign language and then it can develop further. Examples are increasing with the creation of new states in Africa and Asia.

The situation in Greece is different and to a certain extent the reverse of the above. The SV has never been spoken by any speech community. Common MG was not introduced in later centuries, because it is the natural development of AG. It is K which was introduced in later centuries. And as it stands close to MG and at the same time it does not have a norm, it cannot be learned as a foreign language.

REASONS FOR THE CREATION OF MODERN GREEK DIGLOSSIA

It has been pointed out by several scholars that the origins of MG diglossia are to be sought in church traditionalism, questionless acceptance of 18th and 19th century popular prejudices about language in general and Greek in particular and a strong national inferiority complex.

ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCH

Greek Church was already bound to Byzantine tradition. When in the previous centuries Jesuites used MG for their religious propaganda - they could not give orders, they had to try persuasion - the natural reaction was to further equate archaism with Orthodoxy. Good preachers, who correctly or incorrectly believe they have a message to deliver, have been using common

language[27]; they are too few to change the outlook of Greek orthodox Church. Late Byzantine oulook is incompatible with enlightenment.

FALSE LINGUISTIC PREMISES - INFERIORITY COMPLEX

Till well into the 19th century common opinion was that languages degenerated from their original paradisian condition. Even rationalizing explanations appears: ancient languages were better than modern ones, because they had a more complicated flexional system. Latter argument could find its way into the writings of Schlegel[28].

Greek in particular degenerated because of the Ottoman rule. It became the language os slaves. Before the contact with the Turks, Greek had remained pure. Since the contact, it took over Turkish words. We have here the typical attitude of the layman, thinking superficially of languages only in terms of recent loan-words.

There was a mutual influence between educated Greeks and Europeans in this respect. In 1932, in the height of his admiration for the Greeks who had heroically fought the Turks, Victor Hugo wrote in his poem "Canaris" about MG: "Langue d' Homère où Dante a jeté quelques mots". Nine years later, under the influence of recent discussions about the purification of MG, he laments in "Le Rhin":

---

27. The author of the present article asked once a preacher, why he used K, although he knew that the majority of his audience could not understand his delivery and even if they understood, they would not really feel the impact of it. The answer was: "Because I want to make a great impression".

28. cp. O.Jespersen, Language. London 1922,pp.34ff.

"A l' instant même, au seul contact des Turcs, la Grèce, fille de l' Egypte et mère de l' Italie, la Grèce était devenue barbare. Je ne sais quelle lèpre avait défiguré son peuple, son sol, ses monuments, jusqu' à son admirable idiome. Une foule de consonnes farouches et de syllabes hérissées avaient crû, comme la vegetation d' épines et de broussailles qui obstrue les ruines, sur ses mots les plus doux, les plus sonores, les plus harmonieux, les mieux prononcés par les poètes".

Already in the 15th century, a foreigner, Francis Filelfe, after seven years in Constantinople, where he probably learned AG, complains that one can hear pure Greek only from noblemen, especially from noblewomen, who unfortunately do not come in contact with foreigners[29]. If one wants to be malicious, one can point out that AG as spoken by the Byzantine contemporaries of this gentleman or by the French contemporaries of Hugo, or by us for that matter, would have been totally incomprehensible to a native speaker of that language.

In this way the inferiority complex of educated Greeks was strengthened by foreigners. In the article mentioned above, Roger Milliex presents in a masterly fashion the development and the impact of this inferiority complex. It was such opinions that educated Greeks in the 19th century could understand, and not the new discoveries of Bopp or of Rasmus Rask. Characteristically in the Ionian islands, which had not been under Ottoman rule, but had continually benefited from Italian and French culture, appeared in the 19th century the first written literature of importance (ofcourse in D), and the leader of that School, the poet Solomós wrote a theoretical work,

"Diálogos", against K. The Ionian islands at that time were not yet part of the Greek state.

It is understandable that when one learns some kind of AG, one visits Greece and expects to use his knowledge. If he cannot do so, one is disappointed and blames his disappointment on the natives. Also, if Spanish is called Spanish, it does not necessarily have to be Latin. But if Greek is called Greek, how come that it uses words one cannot find in the Liddell-Scott? Still today, notwithstanding the development of Historical Linguistics and the appearance of Structuralism, a Greek can be confronted with the question: "why do you say this with an Italian (or a Turkish) and not with a Greek word?" The speculation is continuing, at what precise moment Greek should have stopped developing.

Eben more competent scholars at the end of the 19th century committed the mistake to compare AG, a language they had studied well, to MG, a language they hardly knew; or to compare highly elaborate ancient li literary style to modern everyday speech. Eduard Schwytzer himself, though aware of the danger, did nevertheless the same mistake[30]. Later still, historical linguists, having as starting point AG, pointed out what the language had lost, discovering that at the same time it had also gained! Naturally support of the modern language want to prove that the languge had gained much. In a grammar published as late as 1960[31] one can find a good sample of many old prejudices.

---

30. Neugriechische Syntax und altgriechische. Neue Jbb. für das k. Altertum 11 (21), 1908, pp.498-507.

31. Nicola Catone, Grammatica neoellenica: vulgar Greek has lost the optative together with the athematic conjugation but has gained the second future.

It is not necessary to repeat the arguments from historical linguistics broughtagainst K. Brugman, Thumb, especially Karl Krumbacher[32] have said what there was to be said about it. Today any college student is supposed to know that languages change and that there is no conceivable reason, why Greek should make an exception.

FALSIFICATION OF THE NATIONAL PAST

Let us now consider other factors responsible for the creation of K, which have eluded investigators, because foreigners cannot have a view of the whole complex and because in Greece such matters are taboo.

The modern Greek nation begun developing national conscience as a result of the struggles for liberation from the Ottoman rule. During the first centuries of the Ottoman rule (15th-17th) only a few intellectuals, under the influence of western ideas, were thinking of Ancient Greece. It is not always easy to find out how far it was conscious to them, that in doing so, they were attacking the still surviving idea of Christian Byzantium.

The prevailing distinction was Christians - Mohammedans. Non-Modammedans were simply called /xristja'ni/ . Only if it was necessary, there could be further distinctions. Greek speaking Christians were still /ro'mji/, speakers of Albanian were /arva'nites/, though last term was mostly used for Mohammedan Albanians. Greek, Slavic or Turkish speaking Mohammedans were simply /'turki/"Turks".

As late as the beginning of the 19th century, in a special category of heroic folk-songs in Greek, dealing

32. Das Problem der modernen griechischen Schridtsprache, 1902.

with the deeds of warlike tribe on the Pindus ountains we hear that when a number of women and children were hard pressed by Mohammedan "Albanians" (/arvani'tja/) in a castle, in order not to give themselves up, they put fire to the ammunition - not a very uncommon thing at those times. The woman leader calls before the dead her daughters-in-law and her grandchildren and exhorts them, not to live as "slaves of Turks", No-one would have though of questioning the sincerity of the song, because those "Turks" were actually Mohammedan Albanians, or because the brave Christian warriors were native speakers of Albanian themselves. Still today, in Slavic oral epics from Bosnia, Mohammedan Slavs call themselves Turci, i.e., "Turks".

But the more the Christians fought, the more they developed national feelings. As the fight went on independently in different Balkan areas, and as in each area there was usually one or another major language and common habits, more specific national feelings were developed. At last, our century witnessed the birth of nationalism also among the Turks.

One would expect Greek educated persons in the 19th century to be perfectly happy with and proud of the struggles of their people of the folk-songs, already famous in Europe, of 17th century Cretan literature, of contemporary Ionian literature. But many of those educated persons came from Constantinople, where they had continued Byzantine governmental policy and Byzantine diplomacy in the service of the Sultans. They had not fought themselves. They despised the "people". The primary meaning of the word for "people", /la'os/, was "vulgus" until approximately the second war.

They wanted to play the role of Byzantine half-aristocracy in 19th century Greece. Their best weapon was K. The idea is still today that "educated persons must be distinguished from vulgar plebeians".

Common MG was given the name dimotikí. Demotikos (pronounced dimoti'kos) had since Lucian and throughout the Middle Ages the primar meaning "plebeian". The cognate feminine dimosia was used in a very specialized sense. When translated, Common MG often becomes the "vernacular". Also the terms "Vulgärgriechisch" ("grec vulgaire", "greco volgare") are used: an imitation of the term "Vulgärlatein" etc., itself a creation of older classicists' prejudices.

Ancient Greek society being the most prestigious one to have ever existed in the area, everyone would like to trace back his origin to the Ancient Greeks. The Slavs, living further north and speaking a different language, could only claim Philip and Alexander the "Macedonians". The Turks could claim the Ionian Philosophers. It was the new Greek state who had to carry the main burden.

European scholars played again their part. After the enthusiasm for the fighting heroic Greek nation, a natural reaction set forth. The medievalist Fallmereyer ("Geschichte der Halbinsel Morea") put forward the thesis, that modern Greeks are in reality Grecisized Slavs and Albanians. Other European scholars answered back. The controversy still continues, among Classicists and Byzantinists sometimes vehemently. Even Campbell and Sherrard, who probably wrote the most perspicious book about Modern Greece[33], could not rid themselves of the

33. John Campbell and Philip Sherrard, Modern Greece. Ernest Benn, London 1968 (Nations of the Modern World). The author of the present article owes more to this book than can be stated in a note.

controversy. A directive issued to German troops during the second war[34], explained, that the soldiers should not have any inhibitions about treating Greeks roughly, as these had no Greek blood in their veins, but were descendents of Slavs and Turks.

Modern Greeks were worth, only if they could be proved to be descendents of the ancient Greeks; this was the attitude even among their friends. At the beginning of this century, a well meaning young English scholar, J. C. Lawson, set forth to study the life of the people. The title of his nice book is programmatic: "Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion - A Study in Survivals"[35]. Needless to say, that he discovered what he was looking for - even if it was not there.

Serious scholars arrived at absurdities. While Gregorovius ("Geschichte der Stadt Athen während des Mittelalters") ascertained that no Greek blood was to be found in the viens of Modern Greeks, Albert Thumb, in an English written article[36], after furnishing statistics on points and percentages of head and skull measurements, some done by himself, came to the conclusion that there may be some Albanian blood mixed with the ancient Greek, but there is really very little Slavic, while in some districts ancient Greek blood is still running pure. Even this slight mixture, he thinks, was all for the good because Albanian rejuvenated ancient Greek blood.

---

34. see Classical Weekly, 1945.

35. Cambridge 1910. cp the review by J. Kakridis in Gnomon 1969 on the occasion of the republication of the book in 1964.

36. in: The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 2, 1914-5.

One may laugh at such preoccupations, but when in 1903 the Bible Society tried to put out a translation of the Bible in MG, there were riots in Athens, because students saw behind this action, the machinations of Panslavism, especially as the translation was favoured by the pious queen Olga, a Russian princess. Because by now the theory of Slavic descent had achieved further implications. It was namely used by Panslavist politicians to claim the whole of the Balkan peninsula. One can only imagine the impact of the attack on the new Greek state.

All Balkan states, with the exception of too small Albania, have good reasons to claim Byzantium. The Greeks were driven to claim Byzantium in their turn. This claim was combined with the "great idea" (megáli idéa) to drive away the Turks and regain all previously Christian territories.

We have two coordinates to explain how K could gain in force, although a national Greek state had been created: inferiority complex towards Ancient Greece and claiming of Byzantium. Speaking AG, or at least writing it, so that those European scholars would not notice the difference, could prove at the same time t things: first, the Ancient Greeks were still there; second, the heirs of Byzantium were there too, as the Byzantines had used AG in their turn. Nothing had changed during three thousand years. The enmity of Christian Byzantium towards Greece was not mentioned and in the end forgotten. In order to claim both, there was created the myth of "Grecochristian Culture", ellinochristianikós politismós. The term appears in the third quarter of the 19th century. The two most

incompatible Weltanschauungen were married - at least on paper. No one cared that this was a caricature, as no one cared that the expression and vehicle for it, K, was equally a caricature of AG. K was even baptized "national language": the falsification was perfect.

The price to be paid was to alter the real history of the nation together with its language. The Greek revolution began as a struggle for national and social liberation. From its very beginning it attracted the enmity of Metternich's Europe and, for the first time a Christian insurrection, the disapproval of the Russian Czar. The Big Powers of the time and Byzantine survivals managed to change the outlook of the new state, together with the written history of the revolution.

The new ideas of racism began to invade Greece. Already the term "Katharévusa" is a racist term: die reine Sprache, die reine Rasse. It is doubtful whether more than 5% of high school graduates in Greece suspect that some of the most famous heroes of the Greek liberation wars were native speakers of Albanian. What about Albanian and Slavic place-names? Simply change them! This is not only the plague of scientists concerned with Namenforschung, as Georgacas complains [37]; it can also be the plague of motorists.

In order to do justice, one should mention that also on the other side of the border Jugoslavian Monastir became Bitolja,

---

37. The Place-names of Southern Poloponnesos

Bulgarian Philippopel became Plovdiv, Turkish Constantinople became Instanbul; only inquisitive philologists are liable to think that Istanbul is of Greek origin as well.

Ofcourse every country falsifies its own history. But it seems that when one transgresses certain limits, the damage is too big. The modern Greek nation, emerging from its Middle Ages rather recently, began discovering its specific national identity later than most Western European, still earlier than many Eastern European nations. Because of the reasons cited above, it is at the moment behind Eastern European nations in attaining full conscience of it. When a nation achieves or is allowed to achieve maturity and independence, it imposes its language as official language too. This is what happened in Western Europe after the supremacy of Latin, later in Middle Europe. The Greek nation has not yet been able to impose its national language as state language.

There has not been any kind of Reformation in Greece, or of an early translation of the Bible, such as Luther's in German, or the older ones for the Moravian Slavs or for the Armenians, on which the use of the national language in written literature (oral literature is another subject) could be based.

SOCIAL STRUCTURE

In some countries, national language could be used rather early in written literature, because of the existence of an aristocracy, who did not care much for the superposed language. No such aristocracy existed in Byzantium and of course not during Ottoman occupation.

In other countries, particularly in France, literary language was further moulded by a strong, educated, self-conscious bourgeoisie. Such a bourgeoisie has hardly existed in Greece in the past. It is perhaps interesting to note that Common MG is more and more used by members of a still small bourgeoisie. By persons with a broader education and some class consciousness, with or without egalitarian tendencies. These are persons who learned their K at school and are turning their back on it, with a kind of snobistic attitude, as one can read sometimes; though it actua actually pays to use K. We tried to make clear that today K is no more the idium of the educated in Greece. Actually the more one is educated the more one disapproves of it.

There has always existed som lip service to the principle of popular sovereignty, especially when French or American history are discussed, bub the principle has not been seriously considered in Greece sinc the days of the Greek revolution. Members of the lower class are not much concerned with the linguistic problem. More independent spirits among them make fun of those using K, others admire the wisdom of persons being able to use it, others come to the conclusion that "those cunning ones are using K on purpose, so that we simple people will not understand what they are really saying". Only a small number among the third class support Common MG consciously. They usually have a strong political consciousness, many of them are communists. The Greek Communist Party has consistently made use of Common MG, because, not being a ruling communist party, it needs to persuade.

This fact has made several intellectuals and educators, strongly concerned with the problem, feel sympathetic towards the Greek Communist Party. It also strengthened the reaction of anticommunists, who very naturally equated K with anticommunism.

But K has deeper sociological implications. is the official language, the language of bureaucracy, of the ruling group. Though not exactly like Byzantine half-aristrocracy, this ruling group is not like the upper classes in other countries either. Its main characteristic and symbol is the use of a different language. Adhering to this language, means acceptance of the outlook and practices of the group; what foreigners sometimes depreciatingly call Balkanism or even Byzantinism (cp. German "Byzantinismus"; or with a different meaning French "byzantinologie"). Perpetrating K means self-perpetration of the group. It means at the same time the exclusion from priv leges of all those who could not learn K. It really needs initiative and courage on the part of a person who has invested time and money in studying K to think of the problem consequently.

It is not by chance, that on the two occasions of somehow liberal and progressive governments, under Venizelos and in 1965, educational reforms introduced national language at schools. It is not by chance either, that under the present military dictatorship national language was again banished from schools, together with modern mathematics, while 75% of university professors doing research on MG were fired.

Education and Impoverishment

The devastating effects of diglossia on education have repeatedly been pointed out, especially by Greek educators. We will mention only a few characteristic ones.

Pupils do not understand or understand only incompletely what they are reading in their textbooks. From primary education to colleges, the usual method of preparation for examinations is the following. The student tries to learn the text by heart through many repetitions. Then he or she asks a colleague, or his mother or his younger brother to take the textbook in his hands. He himself sits opposite and begins reciting, almost in a kind of chanting. Teachers, having been acoustomed to this method themselves, demand it from their students.

Students are obliged to use forms and expressions they partly understand, if at all, and in any way they do not feel as their own. They are trained to accumulate numbers of exact synonyms, because the existence of many synonyms is considered as richness of language. In the end they become accustomed to mere verbalism, not bothering about exactitude or correctness; a situation that leads to intellectual laziness.

Incidentally, as K gives the false impression of being similar to AG and at the same time students are not allowed to compare AG with their native language, Greek students spend more time than any other European students studying AG and learn less.

As was already mentioned, educated persons became insecure in their linguistic habits. They become self-conscious when using certain MG words, forms and expressions which are too obviously not K. In the past, they would have been accused of "peasantry" for using them. Today they can be accused of snobism, of using poetic language in familiar speech. On the other hand, K equivalents either do not exist, or they are not felt as the "real thing", or they seem ridiculous. This state of affairs was already noticed by Roídis in his "Ιέωλα". In this respect, the language of the education in Greece becomes poorer.

E. Petrounias